

REMARKS

The foregoing Amendment in response to the First Office action is accompanied by an Appendix submitting copies of a Preliminary Amendment and Formal Drawings previously submitted but not acknowledged in the Office action.

By the foregoing referred to Amendment, the specification and the claims have been amended so as to emphasize the patentable distinctions of the present invention over the disclosures in the four prior art references cited and relied on for rejection of claims 1-5 as set forth on pages 2, 3, and 4 of the Office action. Amended claims 1-5 patentably distinguish over such prior art references, as hereinafter pointed out.

U.S. Patent Nos. 2002/0031419, 713,231 and 3,881,608 to Weis, Seaver et al. and Hupkes are three of the cited prior art references respectively relied on as the primary reference for rejection of all claims, while U.S. Patent No. 4,883,184 to Albus is relied on as a secondary prior art reference for rejection of claims 4 and 5 in regard to one of the features associated with the present invention. Certain portions of the disclosure only in the Weis patent are explicitly referred to under paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office action as the basis for rejection of all of the claims, which presumably is the same rejection respectively based on the Seaver et al. and Hupkes patents. However according to the disclosure in the Weis patent, as referred to in the Office action, the ropes 15 (cables) extend from a lifting mechanism 14, mounted on the horizontal track support 12, to pulleys on the top of gantry 9 (frame leg). Accordingly, the ropes 15 are not cables fixedly anchored to the top of the gantry 9-10 for suspension of the track support 12 therefrom as in the case of the present invention. Instead the support 12 is fastened to the

gantry 9-10 by connecting elements 13 and struts 11, contrary to the present invention.

The foregoing referred to distinction over the disclosure in the Weis patent is interrelated with other distinctions of the present invention involving use of trolleys that do not pivot, having pivotally displaceable spreaders thereon. Although the Albus patent allegedly discloses a pivotally displaceable load handler, there is no explicit disclosure of such load handling spreaders that are pivotally displaceable on horizontally guided trolleys.

Amended claims 1-5 clearly distinguish over the prior art references applied under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a), based on the latter referred to distinctions. Thus, claim 1 now specifies: "non-pivotal trolleys--cable means fixedly anchored to the frame means for exclusively suspending the rail means--". The allowance of amended claim 1 together with claims 2-5 dependent therefrom is therefore in order and is hereby requested.

Respectively submitted,


JACOB SHUSTER, Reg. No. 19,660
Attorney for Applicants

Tele: 301 227-1835

OFFICE OF COUNSEL CODE 004
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER
CARDEROCK DIVISION HEADQUARTERS
DAVID TAYLOR MODEL BASIN
9500 MACARTHUR BOULEVARD
WEST BETHESDA, MD 20817-5700